



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,581	07/15/2003	Ekambaram Balaji	030773/2868P	8889

7590 10/10/2008
Sandeep Jaggi
LSI Logic Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
1551 McCarthy Blvd., M/S D-106
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER

PRICE, NATHAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/620,581	Applicant(s) BALAJI ET AL.	
	Examiner NATHAN PRICE	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 are pending.
2. This Office Action is in response to communications received 07 August 2008. Previous objections and rejections not included in this Office Action have been withdrawn.
3. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 07 August 2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 07 August 2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection or not persuasive.

5. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach providing an adapter API used to translate data as claimed in step (a) of claim 31. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the APIs that perform mapping for XML can be in the client (§127).

6. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach data sources are stored in different formats and are not directly accessible by other client applications as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the client applications can be based on Java or non-Java systems and can operate on any platform, which teaches or at least suggests the clients use different formats such that the data sources are not directly accessible by other client applications (§37).

7. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach modifying client applications to invoke methods of the API. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the APIs are pluggable, which teaches modifying the client applications to invoke methods of the API (§115, 127).

8. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach the API at the client using a registered schema definition to convert the data as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the APIs that perform mapping for XML can be in the client (§127) and use of registered schema definition to convert the data (§72, 130).

9. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach submitting the XML files to an import repository at a server and storing data in a database as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Initially, use of the same terms (“import repository” and “database”) is not necessary for a reference to teach the same functionality. Sharma teaches or suggests submitting XML files to an import repository by teaching the server can act as a file server (§5). Sharma further teaches or suggests the XML files are parsed and stored in a database by teaching an XML parser and that the server can act as a file server, which would include the database (§5, 173). Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach the import repository and database as being separate, but the claim does not appear to specify that the repository does not contain the database.

10. See the current rejections regarding arguments not specifically addressed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2194

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645 A1; hereinafter Sharma) in view of Ning et al. (See PTO-892 mailed with this Office Action; hereinafter Ning).

12. As to claim 31, Sharma teaches a method for providing data integration and exchange between a plurality of client applications over a network, wherein each of the client applications access a respective data source (§ 5, 65, 115), the method comprising:

(a) providing an adapter API at each of the client applications that provides a first set of methods for the client applications to use to translate data in the respective data sources into XML format, wherein the data sources of each of the client applications are stored in different formats and are not directly accessible by the other client applications (Fig. 5; § 5, 8 – 10, 37, 115, 127);

(b) modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data in the respective data sources into XML format according to a registered schema definition (§ 7, 72, 91, 115, 127, 130);

(c) submitting each of the XML files to an import repository at a server (§ 5, 115, 127); and

(e) parsing the validated XML files in the import repository and storing data in a database at the server according to a hierarchy specified by the corresponding DTD, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources of the client applications (§ 7, 55 – 56, 127, 173).

13. Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the XML format data from the respective data sources in XML files. However, saving the data to a file is at least implied or obvious in view of the environments described by Sharma. Specifically, Sharma teaches storing data in files so that they can be accessed by clients (§5).

14. Sharma fails to specifically teach validation and name/value pairs as claimed. However, Ning teaches validating each of the XML files in the import repository against a document type definition (DTD) corresponding to the respective data sources and storing name/value pairs according to a hierarchy specified by the corresponding DTD (p. 1635 left col. ¶2 last 14 lines; p. 1636 §C). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because Sharma teaches that a streaming parser can be used (§ 123) and Ning provides further details about DTDs and parsers taught by Sharma.

15. As to claim 2, Sharma teaches including a second set of methods in the adapter API for the client applications that provides consumption logic and methods for

automatically exporting data defined in a Web-based schema registry, from the database into the client applications using Web services (§ 5, 28, 115, 127);

16. As to claim 3, Sharma teaches registering the respective data sources with a schema registry in order to create the schema definition and the DTD (§ 7, 72, 91, 130).

17. As to claim 6, Sharma teaches the adapter API includes an XML API comprising the first set of methods and the second set of methods, wherein the first set of methods comprises a Writer API and the second set comprises a Reader API (§ 5, 115, 155, 173).

18. As to claim 7, Sharma teaches that the client applications are modified with generator logic that makes calls to methods comprising the adapter API, wherein once called, the Writer API converts data into the XML format in memory and transports the data to the server (§ 115, 155, 173). See also the rejection of claim 31.

19. As to claim 9, Sharma fails to specifically teach verification as claimed. However, Ning teaches wherein the adapter further includes verification code that verifies the generated XML data against the DTD defined in the schema registry (p. 1635 left col. ¶ 2 last 14 lines; p. 1636 § C).

Art Unit: 2194

20. As to claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 32 and 33, see the rejection of claims 31, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9.

21. As to claim 28, Sharma teaches that the server further includes a schema generator for generating the schema definition, a DTD generator for generating the DTD, and an adapter software kit that is downloaded from the server and used to incorporate the adapter API into the client applications (§ 7, 27, 72, 109).

Conclusion

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NATHAN PRICE whose telephone number is (571)272-4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 2:30pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

NP